

## CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Conor O'Shea	Team: Squad #6	CCRB Case #: 201901985	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Tuesday, 02/27/2018 11:40 PM, Wednesday, 02/28/2018	Location of Incident: [REDACTED]	Precinct: 90	18 Mo. SOL 8/27/2019	EO SOL 8/27/2019	
Date/Time CV Reported Tue, 03/05/2019 8:58 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: In-person	Date/Time Received at CCRB Tue, 03/05/2019 8:58 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Witness(es)	Home Address
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM Patrick Foley	18425	958596	079 PCT
2. POM Anthony Bomparola	15054	955761	079 PCT
3. POM Mohamed Elhanafi	15082	955897	079 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. POM Kevan Williams	27838	929364	079 PCT
2. POM Orlando Adorno	20407	962200	079 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Mohamed Elhanafi	Abuse: In front of the McDonald's located at 700 Broadway in Brooklyn, Police Officer Mohamed Elhanafi stopped § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
B.POM Anthony Bomparola	Abuse: In front of the McDonald's located at 700 Broadway in Brooklyn, Police Officer Anthony Bomparola stopped § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
C.POM Patrick Foley	Abuse: In front of the McDonald's located at 700 Broadway in Brooklyn, Police Officer Patrick Foley stopped § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
D.POM Mohamed Elhanafi	Abuse: In front of the McDonald's located at 700 Broadway in Brooklyn, Police Officer Mohamed Elhanafi frisked § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
E.POM Mohamed Elhanafi	Abuse: In front of the McDonald's located at 700 Broadway in Brooklyn, Police Officer Mohamed Elhanafi searched § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
F.POM Anthony Bomparola	Discourtesy: En route to the 79th Precinct stationhouse, Police Officer Anthony Bomparola spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
G.POM Mohamed Elhanafi	Abuse: Inside of the 79th Precinct stationhouse, Police Officer Mohamed Elhanafi strip-searched § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
H.POM Mohamed Elhanafi	Abuse: Inside of the 79th Precinct stationhouse, Police Officer Mohamed Elhanafi performed a cavity search of § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

### Case Summary

On March 5, 2019, § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint in-person with the CCRB during a field interview for a different CCRB complaint, case #201901595.

On February 27, 2018, at approximately 11:40 p.m., § 87(2)(b) and his fiancée, § 87(2)(b) were walking home from a McDonald's restaurant located at 700 Broadway in Brooklyn when Police Officer Mohamed Elhanafi, Police Officer Anthony Bomparola, and Police Officer Patrick Foley—all from the 79<sup>th</sup> Precinct—stopped § 87(2)(b) in the confines of the 90<sup>th</sup> Precinct (**Allegations A, B, and C: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**). PO Elhanafi frisked and searched § 87(2)(b) (**Allegations D and E: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**). A switchblade knife was recovered, for which § 87(2)(b) was arrested. PO Elhanafi, PO Bomparola, and PO Foley drove § 87(2)(b) back to the 79<sup>th</sup> Precinct stationhouse. En route, PO Bomparola allegedly said to PO Elhanafi, “Good fucking job, you read it out” (**Allegation F: Discourtesy, § 87(2)(g)**). At the stationhouse, PO Elhanafi and PO Bomparola allegedly led § 87(2)(b) to a bathroom near the holding cells, where PO Elhanafi allegedly strip-searched § 87(2)(b) while other prisoners allegedly looked on nearby (**Allegation G: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**). PO Elhanafi allegedly conducted a visual cavity search of § 87(2)(b)'s mouth (**Allegation H: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**). § 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(a) 160.50

The investigation obtained one body-worn camera (BWC) video from PO Foley (**Board Review 36**) and also recorded two cell phone videos (**Board Review 01, 02**) capturing the investigation's manual inspection of the knife vouchered in § 87(2)(b) arrest. PO Foley's BWC video can be found in IA #211, and is summarized in #IA 212 (**Board Review 37**).

### Findings and Recommendations

**Allegation A—Abuse of Authority: In front of the McDonald's located at 700 Broadway in Brooklyn, Police Officer Mohamed Elhanafi stopped § 87(2)(b)**

**Allegation B—Abuse of Authority: In front of the McDonald's located at 700 Broadway in Brooklyn, Police Officer Anthony Bomparola stopped § 87(2)(b)**

**Allegation C—Abuse of Authority: In front of the McDonald's located at 700 Broadway in Brooklyn, Police Officer Patrick Foley stopped § 87(2)(b)**

An attorney was consulted regarding these allegations.

The following facts are undisputed. On February 27, 2018, at approximately 11:40 p.m., § 87(2)(b) and his fiancée, § 87(2)(b) went to a McDonald's restaurant located at 700 Broadway in Brooklyn. § 87(2)(b) was wearing a zip-up hooded sweatshirt with a pocket on either side of the zipper. In one pocket, he had several hundred dollars of rent money. In the other, he had a knife that he uses for work as a handyman. PO Foley, PO Elhanafi, and PO Bomparola arrived at the same McDonald's in an unmarked vehicle, and later stopped § 87(2)(b) outside McDonald's on suspicion that he was concealing a weapon in his front sweatshirt pocket.

§ 87(2)(b) (Board Review 03, 04, 05) testified that, on February 27, 2018, at approximately 10:40 p.m., he and his fiancée, § 87(2)(b) walked from their apartment at § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn to McDonald's at 700 Broadway in Brooklyn after he returned from work. Along the way, they stopped at a Bank of America and withdrew \$700- or \$800-worth of \$100 bills for rent money, which § 87(2)(b) placed in one of his front sweatshirt pockets. In the other sweatshirt pocket—but not clipped to it—§ 87(2)(b) had a box-cutter-style “pocket knife” that he regularly used for work in construction. At McDonald's, § 87(2)(b) ordered food while § 87(2)(b) waited inside with her. § 87(2)(b) eventually felt that he was being watched, so he turned around one time, at which point he saw a heavily-tinted, unmarked sedan that he later learned was occupied by PO Elhanafi, PO Bomparola, and PO Foley. § 87(2)(b) did not turn around more than once to look at their car. Both of his hands were inside of his front sweatshirt pockets. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) waited inside McDonald's for their food for approximately 30 minutes before exiting with their food. PO Elhanafi called out to § 87(2)(b) and stopped him. § 87(2)(b) complied.

§ 87(2)(b) provided photographs of an object that he stated was the same model of the utility knife he had on February 27, 2018 (Board Review 06–09). The photographs depict a retractable razor blade that folds out from the handle and then stays open once fully extended.

In a phone statement, § 87(2)(b) (Board Review 10) stated that she withdrew approximately \$500-worth of \$20 bills for rent money from an ATM inside of McDonald's and handed it to § 87(2)(b) who put it in his front sweatshirt pocket. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) waited for their food for less than 30 minutes. They exited McDonald's once they received their food. § 87(2)(b) was carrying the bag of food, and both of § 87(2)(b) hands were in his front sweatshirt pocket. As they were waiting for the pedestrian light to change, PO Elhanafi, PO Bomparola, and PO Foley approached them. PO Elhanafi called out to § 87(2)(b) and stopped him in particular. PO Elhanafi never asked for, or acquired, § 87(2)(b) name or his identification.

PO Foley (Board Review 11), PO Elhanafi (Board Review 12), and PO Bomparola (Board Review 13) were each interviewed at least 16 months after this incident. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g) when they arrived at the McDonald's in uniform and in an unmarked car to buy food, it appeared that § 87(2)(b) recognized that they were police officers by sight and immediately changed his behavior in a way that the officers interpreted to be evasive and therefore suspicious. They stopped § 87(2)(b) outside of McDonald's, recovered an illegal knife, and arrested him (Board Review 14, 15). The photographs provided by § 87(2)(b) depict a lawful box-cutter—not the type of illegal knife for which § 87(2)(b) was arrested.

PO Foley's memo book entries (Board Review 16) note only that, at 11:40 p.m., one male was stopped at the intersection of Thornton and Broadway—which is the location of the McDonald's restaurant—and that one person was under arrest for § 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(a) 160.50 § 87(2)(b). PO Foley provided no additional details about the stop or arrest in his memo book. PO Foley provided identical written narratives in the complaint report (Board Review 14), and the arrest report (Board Review 15): § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(a) 160.50

§ 87(2)(b) In the criminal court complaint (Board Review 17), § 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(a) 160.50

PO Foley testified (Board Review 11) that the area around this McDonald's was a high-crime area with respect to “stabblings and slashings,” assaults, shootings, and other unspecified

violent crimes. PO Foley, PO Elhanafi, and PO Bomparola entered the McDonald's—in uniform—to purchase food. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were directly in front of the officers in line to purchase food. Once § 87(2)(b) noticed the officers, he said something to § 87(2)(b) at which point § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) stepped out of line and exited the McDonald's without ordering any food. PO Foley felt that this behavior was “weird,” so he, PO Elhanafi, and PO Bomparola followed § 87(2)(b) out of the McDonald's. Based on PO Foley's one month of experience as an Anti-Crime officer, PO Foley believed that § 87(2)(b) behavior was indicative of him either being wanted for a crime or concealing a weapon. PO Foley did not suspect § 87(2)(b) of committing any particular crime.

Outside McDonald's, PO Foley testified (**Board Review 11**), he observed “an object in his § 87(2)(b) pocket that we believed to be a weapon,” specifically, a knife, in a pocket on § 87(2)(b) front torso area. PO Foley believed that this object was a knife at least due to its “distinctive color” of being silver. § 87(2)(b) appeared to have a bulge in this pocket, too, but it looked “like anything you'd have in a pocket.” PO Foley stopped § 87(2)(b) solely because of his observations of the object which he believed to be a knife “in public view,” thereby constituting a violation of the NYC Administrative Code's prohibition against carrying any knife “in public view.” PO Foley did not remember: how far away he was when he made this observation; how much of the knife was visible outside of the pocket; which portion of the knife he believed the silver portion to be; the size of the alleged knife; whether the alleged knife was clipped to a pocket; or if he made any other observations leading him to conclude that the object was a knife.

PO Elhanafi testified (**Board Review 12**) that as he, PO Bomparola, and PO Foley drove up to McDonald's, he observed § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) walking on the sidewalk. PO Elhanafi did not remember whether either of them was holding a McDonald's bag. When § 87(2)(b) was approximately 15 feet away from PO Elhanafi's unmarked vehicle, § 87(2)(b) appeared to notice the officers, and began looking back at them a “couple” of times. § 87(2)(b) appeared to be “holding” the front of his hooded sweatshirt and also appeared to be “blading” his body “away” from the officers. Accordingly, PO Elhanafi suspected that § 87(2)(b) was attempting to conceal “a pistol, a firearm, or a knife” in his front sweatshirt pocket. Before PO Elhanafi could provide further justification for his belief that § 87(2)(b) was concealing *those* weapons in particular, his legal representative, PBA Counsel Kate Conlan, interjected and asked, “Did you see a bulge? Or did you see an L-shape? Or did you see anything like that?” PO Elhanafi then stated, “I would, yeah. I would, yeah, a small bul—yeah, I would, a small bulge, yeah.” PO Elhanafi only mentioned the bulge after Ms. Conlan suggested it. The only observations about the bulge that PO Elhanafi made at the time was that it was “small”—slightly smaller than an iPhone—and located on § 87(2)(b) front near the stomach area, near where a generic hooded sweatshirt's front pocket would be. PO Elhanafi, PO Bomparola, and PO Foley verbally agreed to stop § 87(2)(b) based on his behavior as described above and PO Elhanafi's observation of the bulge as described above.

PO Bomparola testified (**Board Review 13**) that when the officers pulled into the McDonald's parking lot, § 87(2)(b) was standing in line to order food inside of the restaurant along with other individuals. § 87(2)(b) made eye contact with PO Bomparola while looking “extremely nervous.” PO Bomparola interpreted this eye contact to mean that § 87(2)(b) was attempting to discern where PO Bomparola was going. PO Bomparola exited his vehicle, at which point § 87(2)(b) stepped out of line. As the officers approached McDonald's and before they went inside, § 87(2)(b) exited without purchasing any food and still appeared to be



he had the knife in. PO Elhanafi immediately entered that pocket, retrieved the knife, and handed it to PO Bomparola, who attempted to flick it open to no avail. PO Elhanafi patted § 87(2)(b) down, entered all of his pockets, ordered him to turn around, handcuffed him, and arrested him. § 87(2)(b) asked why he was being arrested, and PO Elhanafi said it was due to an open warrant. § 87(2)(b) denied having any open warrants. PO Elhanafi had neither asked for, nor obtained, § 87(2)(b) name or identification at that point in time.

§ 87(2)(b)'s phone statement (**Board Review 06**) was generally consistent with § 87(2)(b) testimony as described above.

PO Foley testified (**Board Review 11**) that an officer—he did not remember who—performed a “quick check” of § 87(2)(b) front sweatshirt pocket. PO Foley clarified this to mean that the pocket was “simultaneously” frisked and searched. PO Foley’s understanding of the Fourth Amendment is that “it’s all the same to me if you’re going into the pocket, or you’re going outside the pocket. You’re still going to the area [of the suspected weapon].” A knife was recovered, which an officer tested and determined to be a switchblade. § 87(2)(b) was then handcuffed, but not yet under arrest. PO Foley did not intend to arrest § 87(2)(b) until he ran his identification, because as an Anti-Crime officer, PO Foley factors a person’s arrest history into his decision to make a knife arrest. A name check revealed that that § 87(2)(b) had an unspecified “active warrant” as well as a lengthy history of “weapons charges” and “violent offenses.” On an NYPD-issued cell phone, officers can view a person’s entire arrest history, including sealed arrests. At this point, and at no point sooner, § 87(2)(b) was under arrest.

PO Elhanafi testified (**Board Review 12**) that he did not remember whether he asked § 87(2)(b) if he “had anything on him” that he “shouldn’t have.” PO Elhanafi’s testimony was internally inconsistent regarding whether and how an officer frisked § 87(2)(b). PO Elhanafi first stated that an officer frisked § 87(2)(b) front sweatshirt pocket, as it was the source of their suspicion. Later, PO Elhanafi testified that PO Foley simply recovered a switchblade knife from § 87(2)(b) front sweatshirt pocket, and he did not remember how the knife was recovered or whether PO Foley patted down the outside of the pocket before entering it. PO Elhanafi denied that PO Foley frisked anywhere on § 87(2)(b) person besides the front sweatshirt pocket. PO Elhanafi did not remember whether he saw any portion of the knife prior to its recovery.

PO Bomparola testified (**Board Review 13**) that he did not remember anything that happened between § 87(2)(b) being stopped and § 87(2)(b) being handcuffed, including how the knife was ultimately recovered.

As discussed previously, neither PO Elhanafi nor PO Bomparola activated their BWC at any point (**Board Review 38**). PO Foley activated his BWC as § 87(2)(b) was being handcuffed, so his BWC does not capture how the knife was recovered, or who did so (**Board Review 36**).

§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)

**Allegation F—Discourtesy: En route to the 79<sup>th</sup> Precinct stationhouse, Police Officer Anthony Bomparola spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)**

The following facts are undisputed. After § 87(2)(b) was handcuffed, PO Elhanafi, PO Foley, and PO Bomparola transported him back to the 79<sup>th</sup> Precinct stationhouse in their

unmarked vehicle. PO Elhanafi drove, PO Bomparola sat in the front passenger's seat, and PO Foley sat in the back seat with § 87(2)(b).

§ 87(2)(b) testified (**Board Review 03, 04**) that, during transport, PO Bomparola told PO Elhanafi, "Good fucking job, you read it out," which § 87(2)(b) took to mean that PO Elhanafi had "read" § 87(2)(b) to be a criminal and stopped him accordingly, leading to his arrest.

PO Bomparola (**Board Review 13**), PO Elhanafi (**Board Review 12**), and PO Foley (**Board Review 11**) denied that any officer said "Good fucking job" or otherwise used profanity while transporting § 87(2)(b) and were not familiar with the phrase, "read [someone] out."

PO Foley's BWC video (**Board Review 36, 37**) depicts the following. Beginning at the 03:08 mark in the video player, PO Bomparola—seated in the front passenger seat—appears to put his left arm either on the back of the driver's seat where PO Elhanafi is sitting, or on PO Elhanafi's shoulder or neck area in a motion possibly consistent with patting him on the shoulder. There appears to be some conversation between PO Elhanafi and PO Bomparola but the audio is muffled by the car engine and static noise from PO Foley moving around in the back seat. PO Elhanafi says "I'm driving." PO Bomparola says something that sounds like, "Good...job man." There appears to be at least some space between "Good" and "job," but what, if any, words are said in between are indiscernible. The video does not depict PO Bomparola using profanity while saying "Good...job" to PO Elhanafi, but does not rule out that possibility.

§ 87(2)(g)

**Allegation G—Abuse of Authority: Inside of the 79<sup>th</sup> Precinct stationhouse, Police Officer Mohamed Elhanafi strip-searched § 87(2)(b)**

**Allegation H—Abuse of Authority: Inside of the 79<sup>th</sup> Precinct stationhouse, Police Officer Mohamed Elhanafi performed a cavity search of § 87(2)(b)**

An attorney was consulted regarding these allegations.

The following facts are undisputed. After § 87(2)(b) was arrested, he was processed at the 79<sup>th</sup> Precinct stationhouse and ultimately lodged in a holding cell. The 79<sup>th</sup> Precinct stationhouse has two sets of holding cells: one set, the "top cells," includes several individual cells in a row; the other set, the "bottom cells," includes a multi-prisoner holding cell for female prisoners, a multi-prisoner holding cell for male prisoners, the cell attendant desk, and a bathroom directly across from the male holding cell. If the bathroom door is open, prisoners in the nearby male holding cell would be able to see inside.

§ 87(2)(b) (**Board Review 03, 04**) testified that PO Elhanafi and PO Bomparola led him into a bathroom by the holding cells and the cell attendant desk. The bathroom door was left open. With approximately five male prisoners watching from the holding cell, PO Elhanafi ordered § 87(2)(b) to remove his socks and shoes, lift up his shirt, and open his mouth. § 87(2)(b) complied. PO Elhanafi ordered § 87(2)(b) to pull his pants all the way down. § 87(2)(b) complied, leaving him standing in his underwear. PO Elhanafi pulled at § 87(2)(b) underwear waistband with his thumbs, lifted up § 87(2)(b) underwear, and shook the waistband as if to see if any contraband would be dislodged. None was recovered. § 87(2)(b) did not remember if his genitals were exposed from the bottom of his boxers when PO Elhanafi pulled them up and shook them. § 87(2)(b) was in the bathroom with PO Elhanafi and PO Bomparola



for approximately 10 to 15 minutes before finally being lodged in the holding cells. The cell attendant, identified as PO Adorno, was in a position to have seen this entire interaction. PO Foley was not present.

The investigation was able to identify one other prisoner who was possibly present when § 87(2)(b) was being lodged in the holding cells, § 87(2)(b) but was unable to establish contact with, or obtain a statement from, § 87(2)(b) (See IAs for contact attempts). The investigation was unable to determine whether any other potential witnesses exist.

PO Elhanafi (**Board Review 12**), PO Bomparola (**Board Review 13**), and PO Foley (**Board Review 11**) were all unable to remember whether they personally escorted § 87(2)(b) to the holding cells, which set of holding cells § 87(2)(b) was lodged in, whether he was ever brought to a bathroom, or what they were individually doing during § 87(2)(b) arrest processing. § 87(2)(b) did not do anything that made it seem like he was attempting to conceal contraband on his person, and was calm throughout the process. PO Elhanafi stated that prisoners are commonly brought to the bathroom to remove their belts, shoelaces, and other strings, whereas PO Foley stated this usually happens by the holding cells, but not in the bathroom per se. PO Elhanafi and PO Bomparola did not remember: if § 87(2)(b) was ordered to remove his pants; if § 87(2)(b) was strip-searched; or if § 87(2)(b) was ordered to open his mouth for visual inspection. PO Foley denied that each of those actions occurred. PO Foley believed that conducting a visual cavity search of a prisoner's mouth was not "strange," and PO Bomparola believed it was part of "normal" arrest processing. They both attributed this to the hypothetical possibility, not present in this case, that a prisoner could hide a razor blade in his mouth.

PO Adorno (**Board Review 29**) testified that he was assigned as the cell attendant for the same time period during which § 87(2)(b) was lodged in the holding cells and had his arrest processed. At some point, an unidentified prisoner complained to PO Adorno regarding some interaction with police officers. PO Adorno did not remember the specifics of this complaint, what the prisoner looked like, or the prisoner's gender. PO § 87(2)(b) did not recognize § 87(2)(b) when shown a photograph of him. PO Adorno did not remember seeing § 87(2)(b) PO Foley, PO Elhanafi, or PO Bomparola during his tour, nor did he remember if § 87(2)(b) was the complaining prisoner. PO Adorno did not remember whether any prisoners were brought into the bathroom by the cell attendant's desk. PO Adorno denied: seeing or hearing any officer order a civilian to take their pants off; hearing any officer order a civilian to open their mouth for inspection; or seeing any strip-search occur during his tour.

There is no notation in the Command Log entry for § 87(2)(b) arrest (**Board Review 30**) regarding a strip search. § 87(2)(b) arrest was logged at 11:48 p.m. on February 27, 2018. An inspection of the cells a few minutes later, at 11:55 p.m. revealed that there were two unspecified prisoners lodged. § 87(2)(b)'s arrest was logged at 12:30 a.m. on February 28, 2018.

§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)

[REDACTED]

§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)

[REDACTED]

§ 87(2)(g)

### Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- § 87(2)(b)
  - [REDACTED]
  - [REDACTED]
  - [REDACTED]
  - [REDACTED]
  - [REDACTED]
  - [REDACTED]
  - [REDACTED]
  - [REDACTED]
  - [REDACTED]
- PO Foley has been a member of service for four years and a subject in four other CCRB complaints and nine other allegations, none of which were substantiated. § 87(2)(g)
- PO Elhanafi has been a member of service for five years and a subject in five other CCRB complaints and 18 other allegations, none of which have been substantiated. § 87(2)(g)
- PO Bomparola has been a member of service for five years and a subject in seven other CCRB complaints and 25 other allegations, six of which have been substantiated:
  - CCRB case #201704022 involved substantiated allegations of a vehicle stop, vehicle search, and frisk, § 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g). The Board recommended Command Discipline-A. The NYPD does not appear to have imposed any discipline to date.
  - CCRB case #201707955 involved a substantiated allegation of a refusal to provide name/shield and unsubstantiated allegations of a frisk and a vehicle search. The Board Recommended, and the NYPD imposed, Instructions.
  - CCRB case #201710310 involved substantiated allegations of a frisk and vehicle search; an exonerated allegation of a vehicle stop; an unsubstantiated allegation of a search of person; and two unsubstantiated allegations of discourtesy. The Board recommended Command Discipline-B. The NYPD imposed Formalized Training.
  - § 87(2)(g)

### Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

- § 87(2)(b) declined to mediate this complaint.
- A FOIL request for Notices of Claim filed by § 87(2)(b) regarding this incident was submitted to the NYC Office of the Comptroller on July 21, 2019. To date, this request is still pending (**Board Review 33**).
- § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]
- § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

---

Squad No.: #06

Investigator:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date
Squad Leader:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date
Reviewer:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date